

MARLENE S. MURACO, Bar No. 154240  
[mmuraco@littler.com](mailto:mmuraco@littler.com)  
LITTLER MENDELSON  
A Professional Corporation  
50 West San Fernando Street  
15th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113.2303  
Telephone: 408.998.4150

Attorneys for Defendants  
ESIS, INC., ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE  
COMPANY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MARIA ABRAHIM,

Plaintiff,

v.

ESIS, INC., ACE AMERICAN  
INSURANCE COMPANY,,

Defendants.

Case No. C07-4014 JCS

**ERRATA TO DEFENDANT ESIS, INC.  
AND ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE  
COMPANY'S REPLY MEMORANDUM  
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO  
COMPEL ARBITRATION**

Date: February 1, 2008  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Judge: Judge Joseph Spero  
Dept: Courtroom A, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor

TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants ESIS, INC. and ACE AMERICAN  
INSURANCE COMPANY ("Defendants"), hereby attaches a true and correct copy of the Table of  
Contents and Table of Authorities, as Exhibit A to Defendant Esis, Inc. and Ace American Insurance  
Company's Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Their Motion to Compel  
Arbitration, that is linked to the brief that was electronically filed on January 11, 2008.

///

///


///

///

(CASE NUMBER: C07-4014 JCS)

**ERRATA TO DEFTS REPLY MPA IN SUPPORT OF  
THEIR MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION**

1 Dated: January 14, 2008

2  
3   
4 MARLENE S. MURACO  
5 LITTLER MENDELSON  
6 A Professional Corporation  
7 Attorneys for Defendants  
8 ESIS, INC., ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE  
9 COMPANY

10  
11 Firmwide:84048720.1 035894.1044  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT “A”**

**To Errata to Defendant ESIS, Inc. and  
ACE American Insurance Company’s  
Reply Memorandum of Points and  
Authorities in Support of Their  
Motion to Compel Arbitration**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT .....	1
A. The Court Should Not Disregard The Declaration Of Denise Carson .....	1
1. Defendants' Failure To Complete Its Initial Disclosures Was A Harmless Error .....	1
2. Ms. Carson's Declaration Is Based Upon Personal Knowledge And Contains Admissible Evidence .....	4
B. The ACE Arbitration Agreement Is Not Unconscionable .....	5
1. The Agreement's Procedural Unconscionability Is Minimal. ....	5
2. Plaintiff Cannot Show That The Agreement Is Substantively Unconscionable .....	8
3. Assuming, Arguendo, That The Agreement Contains Improper Provisions, They Are Severable And The Remainder Of The Agreement Must Be Enforced .....	13
III. CONCLUSION .....	14

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## PAGE

## CASES

24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court, 66 Cal.App.4th 1199 (1998).....	8
Alliance Communs. Techs., Inc. v. AT&T Corp., 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 15645, 3-4 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).....	3
American Software, Inc. v. Ali (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 1386.....	6, 8
Armendariz v. Foundation Health Psychcare Servs., (2000) 24 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 83.....	passim
Brookwood v. Bank of America, 45 Cal.App.4th 1667.....	8
California Grocers Assn. v. Bank of America, (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 205.....	8
Circuit City Stores v. Adams, (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 889.....	13
Engalla v. Permanente Medical Group, Inc., (1997) 15 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 951.....	5
Fittante v. Palm Springs Motors (2003) 105 Cal.App.4th 708.....	6, 14
Flores v. Transamerica HomeFirst, Inc., (2001) 93 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 846.....	6
Gentry v. Superior Court, (2007) 42 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 443.....	10
Graham v. Scissor-Tail, Inc., (1981) 28 Cal.3d 807.....	5
Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Wade, (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) 485 F.3d 1032.....	3
Ingle v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) 328 F.3d 1165.....	passim
Jones v. Citigroup, Inc., (2006) 135 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1491.....	5
Kinney v. United HealthCare Services, Inc. (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1322.....	6
Lagatree v. Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps, (1999) 74 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> at 1122-1123.....	6
Lambright v. Fed. Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91075 (D. Cal. 2007).....	9, 11
McManus v. CIBC World Markets Corp. (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 76.....	6, 13

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(CONTINUED)

**PAGE**

<i>Rowland v. Am. Gen. Fin., Inc.</i> , (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) 340 F.3d 187 .....	3
<i>Sheets v. Yamaha Motors Corp.</i> , (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) 891 F.2d 533 .....	3
<i>Sinclair v. Servicemaster Co.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84206 (D. Cal. 2007) .....	9
<i>Smith v. Sara Lee Fresh, Inc.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94288, 15-16 (D. Cal. 2007) .....	9
<i>Szetela v. Discover Bank</i> , 97 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1094, 1099 (2002), <i>cert. denied</i> , 537 U.S. 1226 (2003) .....	5
<i>U.S. Axminster v. Chamberlain</i> , 176 F.R.D. 532, 533 (D.Miss. 1997) .....	2

**STATUTES**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(c)(1) .....	2, 3
--	------

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

6 JAMES WM. MOORE ET AL., MOORE'S FEDERAL PRACTICE, § 37.63 (3d ed. 1997) .....	2
--	---